

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMME United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR CONFIRMATION NO APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 09/890,440 08/01/2001 P56560PCT Yong-Woon Han 07/13/2004 EXAMINER ROBERT E. BUSHNELL LEUNG, PHILIP H 1522 K STREET NW ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-1202

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u></u>			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	IV
Office Action Summary	09/890,440	HAN ET AL.	V
	Examiner	Art Unit	-
	Philip H Leung	3742	_
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	iress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed /s will be considered timely the mailing date of this co	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 A</u> _I 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		merits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-11,13-18 and 20-26 is/are pending i 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7 and 8 is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-5,9,14-16 and 21-24 is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 6,10,11,13,17,18,20,25 and 26 is/are 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration. objected to.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the conference of the conference of the open conference of the conference of	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CF	. ,
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National S	Stage
Attachment(s)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4-6-2004</u>. 	4)		152)

Application/Control Number: 09/890,440 Page 2

Art Unit: 3742

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the amendment filed on 4-6-2004, claims 1-6 and 9-26 are considered as readable on the elected species. Only claims 7 and 8 are withdrawn from consideration.

- 2. Upon reconsideration, the indication that claims 12 and 19 (now rewritten in independent form as claims 9 and 16, respectively), along with claims 14 and 15 which depend from claim 12 and claims 20 and 21 which depend from claim 19 in the previous Office action contain allowable subject matter is hereby rescinded. The indication was an error because these claims only combined the two features that were separately claimed in claim 1 and the original claims 9 and 16 and rejected under Low et al (US 5,276,300). Any inconveniences may cause the applicant by this action is sincerely regretted.
- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 9 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Low et al (US 5,276,300) (previously cited by the applicant).

Low shows a DC 28 powered microwave oven having a driving circuit with an inverter 106, 216, a high voltage transformer 70, a magnetron 33 and a pulse driving unit (see Figures 5,

Page 3

Art Unit: 3742

7 and 8). The pulse width modulator 242 in Figure 7 (see col. 6, lines 54-64) and the pulse generating circuits in the inverter 216 of Figure 8 (see col. 8, lines 7-20) are the claimed pulse driving unit. It also shows the use of an excessive current unit (370, 372, 374, 359, 360, 362, 366, etc.) for detecting a current supplied from the DC power supply to the inverter and outputting a signal to the pulse driving unit to at least reduce the pulse for the generation of the driving pulses for the operation of the microwave oven (see Figure 8, col. 8, lines 39-57). Although it does not explicitly state to cut off the generation of the driving pulses when the detected current corresponds to an excess current, it teaches to produce an output 356 from comparator 374 goes sharply negative and causes a pulse width reduction by way of comparator 359 (see Figure 8 and col. 8, lines 49-57). That is, this signal of reduced pulse width would be applied to the pulse generating circuits of the inverter 216 (or the pulse width modulator 242) which would also reduce the width of pulses to the FET switches 190 and 192 and therefore, decrease the magnetron output accordingly. It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art to realize when the excessive current reaches an unsafe level, the pulse width of the output of comparator 359 will reduce to a minimum level such as zero and that would also cut off the drive pulse to the FET switches in order to protect the microwave heating system. In regard to claim 2, comparators 359, 366 and 374 are the claimed comparison part. In regard to claim 4, Low shows the use of FETS 190 and 192 as the inverter. In regard to claims 9 and 16, Low also shows the use of a switching unit and a switch monitor unit (68, 46, 48, 10, 122, etc.) for cutting off the supply when the door is open (see Figure 4 and col. 3, line 56 - col. 4, line 65).

5. Claims 3, 5, 14, 15 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Low et al (US 5,276,300), in view of Akazawa et al (US 5,237,140) (previously cited).

As set forth above, Low shows substantially every feature and structure as claimed except for the engineering design variation of the feedback control unit, such as the use of amplifier and transistor for the control signal. Akazawa shows a DC microwave oven with a battery and a sensing circuit to monitor the voltage of the battery to feedback control the operation of the microwave oven. The sensing circuit includes comparator 24 with a reference input, amplifier 23, diode 26 and transistor 25 for controlling the on-off of 53 of the inverter 3 for the microwave oven (see Figure 11 and col. 8, lines 18-59). It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art to modify Low with a routine feedback circuit with amplification and a switching transistor for better control the operation of the microwave oven according to the sensed condition of the DC power supply, in view of the teaching of Akazawa.

- 6. Claims 6, 10, 11,13, 17, 18, 20, 25 and 26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 9, 14-16 and 21-24 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3742

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip H Leung whose telephone number is (703) 308-1710.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robin Evans can be reached on (703) 305-5766. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Philip H Leung

Primary Examiner Art Unit 3742

P.Leung/pl 7-9-2004